arXiv:hep-th/0412008v1 1 Dec 2004

CERN-PH-TH/2004-240
`hep-th/0412008`

Moduli stabilization from magnetic fluxes in type I string theory

I. Antoniadis [1]*, **T. Maillard**[1,2]

[1]*CERN Theory Division CH–1211, Genève 23, Switzerland*
[2]*Institut für Theoretische Physik, ETH Hönggerberg*
CH–8093 Zürich, Switzerland

Abstract

We show that type I string theory compactified in four dimensions in the presence of constant internal magnetic fields possesses $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric vacua, in which all Kähler class and complex structure closed string moduli are fixed. Furthermore, their values can be made arbitrarily large by a suitable tuning of the quantized magnetic fluxes. We present an explicit example for the toroidal compactification on T^6 and discuss Calabi-Yau generalizations. This mechanism can be complementary to other stabilization methods using closed string fluxes but has the advantage of having an exact string description and thus a validity away from the low-energy supergravity approximation. Moreover, it can be easily implemented in constructions of string models based on intersecting D-branes.

---

[*] On leave of absence from CPHT, Ecole Polytechnique, UMR du CNRS 7644.

1 Introduction

The problem of moduli stabilization in string compactifications is of great interest and significant progress has been made recently based on closed string fluxes [1, 2]. For instance, by a suitable choice of NS-NS (Neveu Schwarz - Neveu Schwarz) and R-R (Ramond - Ramond) 3-form fluxes, one can find $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric vacua where all complex structure moduli, as well as the dilaton, are fixed [1]. A disadvantage of the method is that there is no exact string description of such fluxes and thus the analysis is restricted to the lowest order in α' expansion, described by the effective field theory. Moreover, generalization of the stabilization mechanism to Kähler class moduli requires introduction of non-perturbative effects which are again treated in the low-energy supergravity approximation [3].

In this work, we present an alternative mechanism of moduli stabilization based on open string constant magnetic backgrounds that have an exact description in string theory [4, 5]. In fact, magnetic fluxes can be turned on in any 2-cycle of the internal compactification manifold. In the simplest case, magnetic backgrounds on (1,1)-cycles fix Kähler class moduli [6], while backgrounds on holomorphic (2,0)-cycles fix complex structure moduli. This is illustrated in a simple example of a toroidal compactification on T^6, with a suitable choice of internal magnetic fields that must be turned on in several Cartan directions of the higher-dimensional ($D9$-brane) gauge group (such as $SO(32)$). In this example, we demonstrate that all closed string moduli, but the dilaton, can be fixed in a vacuum preserving $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry, in terms of the magnetic fluxes.

There are three important ingredients in this stabilization mechanism. The first is the non linearity of the Dirac-Born-Infeld (DBI) action which allows to fix all Kähler class moduli, including the overall volume. The second is the fact that magnetized $D9$-branes in a six dimensional internal manifold induce partly negative five-brane tension, which makes possible tadpole cancellation in a supersymmetric configuration, without adding lower dimensional D-branes or orientifold planes (such as $D5$ or $O5$). The third is the use of magnetic fluxes in non-diagonal directions of the internal space which allows to fix all non-diagonal components of the metric. For instance, in the particular example we present in this work, the metric is fixed to a completely diagonal form. It is also interesting to point out that despite the use of α' corrections (non-linear terms), it turns out that the moduli can be stabilized at arbitrarily large values by tuning appropriately the quantized magnetic fluxes.

This mechanism can be obviously combined with the presence of closed type IIB string 3-form fluxes, allowing to fix the dilaton and the complex structure of more general compactification manifolds. It can also be easily implemented in constructions of string models based on D-branes at angles. Finally, it should be a priori possible to generalize it in order to stabilize moduli in vacua with broken supersymmetry, following arguments similar to those of refs. [3, 1] for 3-form fluxes.

Our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the main properties of the six-dimensional toroidal compactification and its moduli space [7, 8]. In Section 3, we consider open string propagation in the presence of constant internal magnetic fields [4] and summarize the conditions for unbroken supersymmetry. In Section 4, we extract the equations that guarantee the existence of one unbroken supersymmetry preserved by a stack of magnetized D9-branes [9, 10] and study the conditions for which this supersymmetry is the same with the one preserved by lower dimensional D-branes. In Section 5, we analyze the above conditions and show how the moduli can be stabilized by a suitable choice of several magnetic backgrounds in the Cartan subalgebra of the gauge group. We also study the tadpole cancellation conditions which are required for consistency of type I string vacua. In Section 6, we come back to the toroidal T^6 compactification and present an explicit solution of the supersymmetry equations and tadpole cancellation conditions that fixes all Kähler class and complex structure moduli in terms of the magnetic fields. For completeness, we also give an explicit numerical solution in Appendix A. In Section 7, we show that the above solution can be appropriately “rescaled” to generate arbitrarily large values for the internal radii. Moreover, in Appendix B, we present a corresponding numerical example. In Section 8, we describe the stabilization of the R-R moduli. In particular, we show that those complexifying the Kähler class metric deformations are stabilized by being absorbed in the (anomalous) magnetized $U(1)$ gauge fields that become massive [10]. Finally in Section 9, we discuss generalizations of the method to orbifolds and more general compactifications, the problem of fixing the dilaton and other concluding remarks.

2 Torus compactification

2.1 Parametrization of T^6

Consider a six-dimensional torus T^6 having six coordinates x^i, y_i with $i = 1, 2, 3$ and periodicity normalized to unity $x^i = x^i + 1$, $y_i = y_i + 1$ [7]. We choose then the orientation

$$\int_{T^6} dx^1 \wedge dy_1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dy_2 \wedge dx^3 \wedge dy_3 = 1 \qquad (2.1)$$

and define the basis of the cohomology $H^3(T^6,\mathbb{Z})$

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_0 &= dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3 \\
\alpha_{ij} &= \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ilm} dx^l \wedge dx^m \wedge dy_j \\
\beta^{ij} &= -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{ilm} dy_l \wedge dy_m \wedge dx^j \\
\beta^0 &= dy_1 \wedge dy_2 \wedge dy_3,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

forming a symplectic structure on T^6:

$$\int_{T^6} \alpha_a \wedge \beta^b = -\delta_a^b\ , \quad \text{for } a,b = 1,\cdots,h_3/2\,, \tag{2.3}$$

with $h_3 = 20$, the dimension of the cohomology $H^3(T^6,\mathbb{Z})$.

We can also choose complex coordinates

$$z^i = x^i + \tau^{ij} y_j, \tag{2.4}$$

where τ^{ij} is a complex 3×3 matrix parametrizing the complex structure. In this basis, the cohomology $H^3(T^6,\mathbb{Z})$ decomposes in four different cohomologies corresponding to the purely holomorphic parts and those with mixed indices:

$$H^3(T^6,\mathbb{Z}) = H^{3,0}(T^6,\mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^{2,1}(T^6,\mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^{1,2}(T^6,\mathbb{Z}) \oplus H^{0,3}(T^6,\mathbb{Z}). \tag{2.5}$$

The purely holomorphic cohomology $H^{3,0}$ is one-dimensional and is formed by the holomorphic three-form Ω for which we choose the normalization

$$\Omega = dz^1 \wedge dz^2 \wedge dz^3. \tag{2.6}$$

2.2 Moduli space

Consider now the deformations δg_{ij}, $\delta g_{i\bar{j}}$ of the flat metric on T^6 [8] . The purely holomorphic variation δg_{ij} is parametrized by elements of the cohomology $H^{2,1}$. Indeed, one can represent the corresponding $(2,1)$ deformations as:

$$\chi_{\tilde{a}\,\kappa\lambda\bar{\mu}} \equiv -\frac{1}{2}\Omega^{\bar{\nu}}{}_{\kappa\lambda}\,\frac{\partial g_{\bar{\mu}\bar{\nu}}}{\partial \tau^{\tilde{a}}}\ , \quad \tilde{a} = 1,\ldots,h_{2,1}, \tag{2.7}$$

where $h_{2,1} = \dim H^{2,1}$.

Next, we write the space of complex structures in terms of the periods of the holomorphic 3-form. Define the canonical homology basis (A_a, B^b) dual to the basis of H^3 given in (2.2) by rewriting the symplectic structure (2.3) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{A_a} \alpha_b &=: \int_{T^6} \alpha_b \wedge \beta^a = -\delta_b^a \\
\int_{B^a} \beta^b &=: \int_{T^6} \beta^b \wedge \alpha_a = \delta_a^b
\end{aligned}$$

The periods of the holomorphic 3-form are then defined as

$$\tau^a = \int_{A_a} \Omega\,. \tag{2.8}$$

Comparing with the definition (2.6) for Ω, we can identify the matrix elements of τ in the parametrization (2.4) of the complex basis with the periods of Ω. The dimension of the space of complex structure moduli is then given by the dimension of the cohomology $H^{2,1}$ on the torus T^6, $h_{2,1} = 9$.

On the other hand, the metric variation $\delta g_{i\bar{\jmath}}$ is parametrized by elements of the $H^{1,1}$ cohomology

$$J = i\delta g_{i\bar{\jmath}} dz^i \wedge dz^{\bar{\jmath}}\,. \tag{2.9}$$

Let e_A, $A = 1, \ldots, h_{1,1}$, be a basis of $H^{1,1}$. In our case, one can choose:

$$e^{i\bar{\jmath}} = i dz^i \wedge dz^{\bar{\jmath}}\,, \tag{2.10}$$

so that the Kähler form can be parametrized as

$$J = J_{i\bar{\jmath}} e^{i\bar{\jmath}}\,. \tag{2.11}$$

The elements $J_{i\bar{\jmath}}$ satisfy the reality condition $J^{\dagger}_{i\bar{\jmath}} = J_{j\bar{\imath}}$, implying that J depends on nine real parameters. They can be used to parametrize the space of Kähler deformations whose dimension is given by the dimension of the cohomology $H^{1,1}$ on the torus T^6, $h_{1,1} = 9$.

3 Type I string theory: Fluxes and conserved supercharges

3.1 Magnetic fluxes

Consider a stack of N coincident $D9$ branes, giving rise to a $U(N)$ $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric gauge theory. Pick up a $U(1)$ subgroup in the Cartan subalgebra of $U(N)$ with gauge potential A, and turn on a constant magnetic field. Thus, the corresponding field strength F_{kl} is constant and $A_k = -\frac{1}{2}F_{kl}u^l$, where u^l stands for all six coordinates of T^6, x^i and y^i. This constant magnetic background couples to the boundary of the open string on the brane by quadratic terms in the world-sheet action S_{ws} [4]. The corresponding conformal field theory can therefore be solved exactly:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{ws} &= -\frac{1}{4\pi\alpha'}\int_{\Sigma} dt d\sigma \left(\partial_\alpha X^\mu \partial^\alpha X_\mu - i\bar{\psi}^\mu \rho^\alpha \partial_\alpha \psi_\mu\right) \\ &\quad - \int dt q_L F_{kl}\left(X^k \partial_t X^l - \frac{i}{2}\bar{\psi}^k \rho^0 \psi^l\right)_{\sigma=0} \\ &\quad - \int dt q_R F_{kl}\left(X^k \partial_t X^l - \frac{i}{2}\bar{\psi}^k \rho^0 \psi^l\right)_{\sigma=\pi} \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where α' is the Regge slope, ψ^μ are the real Majorana fermionic superpartners of the coordinates X^μ and ρ^α with $\alpha = 0, 1$ are the two-dimensional gamma-matrices. The indices k, l run over the magnetized dimensions $k, l = 4, \cdots, 9$, whereas the indices μ, ν run over all ten-dimensional spacetime coordinates $\mu, \nu = 0, \cdots, 9$. The couplings of the left and right endpoints of the open string to the background are given by the corresponding charges q_L and q_R.

The field F_{kl} corresponds to a non trivial $U(1)$ gauge bundle over the torus T^6 with transition function around the cycles u_k:

$$A_k\big|_{u^l+1} = \left(A_k - ie^{-iq\theta}\partial_k e^{iq\theta}\right)\bigg|_{u^l}, \quad \theta = F_{kl}u^l \tag{3.2}$$

with $q = q_L + q_R$. Imposing the phase over each cycle u^k to be single-valued leads to the usual Dirac quantization condition

$$q \cdot F_{kl} = 2\pi m_{kl}, \quad \forall\, k, l = 4, \ldots, 9\,, \tag{3.3}$$

where m_{kl} are integers corresponding to the first Chern class of the $U(1)$ gauge bundle. We can extend this quantization condition by taking into account the multiplicity n_{kl} of the winding around the 2-cycles $[u^k, u^l]$. Equation (3.3) is then modified as [12]:

$$q \cdot F_{kl} = 2\pi \frac{m_{kl}}{n_{kl}}, \quad \forall\, k, l = 4, \ldots, 9\,. \tag{3.4}$$

Finally, we can easily extend our analysis in the presence of a NS-NS B-field, which in type I compactifications has quantized values [11]. Its effect consists of replacing $q \cdot F$ by $q \cdot F - B/(2\pi\alpha')$. This amounts to shifting the integers m_{kl} in the above quantization condition by $m_{kl} - bn_{kl}$, where b is quantized and equals $1/2$ or 0 in the toroidal case [see eq. (3.7) below].

3.2 Supersymmetry

The presence of constant internal magnetic fields generically breaks supersymmetry by shifting the masses of the four dimensional scalars and fermions [5]. For suitable choice of the fluxes and moduli however, a four-dimensional supersymmetric theory can be recovered [10]. In this section, we analyze the conditions under which a supersymmetric vacuum can exist.

Consider the supersymmetric $D9$ brane action of type IIB string theory [13]:

$$V = V_{DBI} + V_{WZ}\,, \tag{3.5}$$

where

$$V_{DBI} = -\int [d^{10}X] e^{-\phi}\sqrt{-\det(g_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu})} \tag{3.6}$$

is the Dirac-Born-Infeld (DBI) action extended in the superspace and V_{WZ} is the corresponding Wess-Zumino (WZ) term. ϕ is the string dilaton and $\mathcal{F}$ is the 2-form field strength:

$$\mathcal{F} = 2\pi\alpha' q F - B \,, \tag{3.7}$$

with F the usual field strength of the $U(1)$ gauge field, $F = dA$, on the worldvolume of the D-brane with charge q, whereas B is the 2-form potential of the NS-NS closed string sector. In the superspace formalism, the superspace forms may be expanded in terms of the basis 1-forms dZ^M, or equivalently, in the inertial frame basis $E^A = dZ^M E_M^A$, with E_M^A being the supervielbein of type IIB supergravity. The basis E^A decomposes under the action of the Lorentz group into a Lorentz vector E^a and a Lorentz spinor $E^{\alpha I}$. For type IIB superspace, the latter is a pair of Weyl Majorana spinors, $I = 1, 2$. The metric in the DBI action is defined as

$$g_{\mu\nu} = E_\mu^a E_\nu^b \eta_{ab} \,. \tag{3.8}$$

The superspace extension of the Wess Zumino (WZ) action is similar

$$I_{WZ} = \int C e^{\mathcal{F}} \,, \tag{3.9}$$

where C is a formal sum over the r-forms superspace potentials C_r:

$$C = \sum_{r=0}^{10} C_r \,, \tag{3.10}$$

with r even.

The action (3.5) is invariant under the κ-symmetry transformations:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\kappa Z^M E_M^a &= 0 \\ \delta_\kappa Z^M E_M^\alpha &= [\bar{\kappa}(1+\Gamma)]^\alpha \\ \delta_\kappa A_\mu &= E_\mu^C \delta_\kappa E^D B_{DC} \\ \delta B &= \frac{1}{2} E^A E^D \delta_\kappa E^C H_{CDA} + d(E^A \delta_\kappa E^C B_{CA}) \\ \delta_\kappa \phi &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where $\bar{\kappa}$ is a ten-dimensional Majorana-Weyl spinor parameter, A_μ is the gauge potential, and the 3-form H_{ABC} is the field strength of B_{BC}, $H = dB$. Its non-zero elements are $H_{\alpha\beta c} = i\sigma_3 \left(\Gamma_c \frac{1+\Gamma^{(11)}}{2}\right)_{\alpha\beta}$, with Γ_c the spacetime gamma-matrices. The matrix Γ for a $D9$ brane, appearing in the second relation of (3.11), is

$$\Gamma = \frac{\sqrt{|g|}}{\sqrt{|g+\mathcal{F}|}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n n!} \gamma^{\mu_1\nu_1\ldots\mu_n\nu_n} \mathcal{F}_{\mu_1\nu_1} \ldots \mathcal{F}_{\mu_n\nu_n} J_{(9)}^{(n)} \tag{3.12}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} J_{(9)}^{(n)} &= (-1)^n \sigma_3^{n+3} i\sigma_2 \otimes \Gamma^{(11)} \\ \Gamma^{(11)} &= \frac{1}{10!\sqrt{|g|}} \epsilon^{\mu_1\cdots\mu_{10}} \gamma_{\mu_1\cdots\mu_{10}}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where $\gamma_{i_1\cdots i_n} = \frac{1}{n!}\gamma_{[i_1}\cdots\gamma_{i_n]}$ denotes complete antisymmetrization of the corresponding gamma matrices, and the first term $n = 0$ in the sum of (3.12) is reduced to $J_{(9)}^{(0)}$. Here, we denote $|g| = \det g_{\mu\nu}$, $|g+\mathcal{F}| = \det(g_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu})$, $\sigma_i,\ i = 1,2,3$ the usual Pauli matrices, and $\gamma_\mu = E^a_\mu \Gamma_a$. Therefore, the fraction of supersymmetry preserved by the $D9$ branes is given by the dimension of the space of solutions of [14]:

$$(1-\Gamma)\epsilon = 0\,, \tag{3.14}$$

where ϵ is the spinorial spacetime supersymmetry parameter $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2)^T$.

On the other hand, considering the $D9$ brane as a source in a supergravity configuration, a supersymmetric vacuum asks for a second condition. The expectation value of a supersymmetry transformation of the gravitino must vanish in the the chosen background

$$< \delta_\epsilon \Psi_\mu >= 0\ , \tag{3.15}$$

which leads to the usual covariantly constant spinor equation

$$\nabla_\mu \epsilon = 0\,. \tag{3.16}$$

The number of conserved supercharges in our magnetic background is then given by the dimension of the space of solutions of the covariantly constant spinors, satisfying:

$$(1-\Gamma)\epsilon = 0\,. \tag{3.17}$$

4 Existence of supersymmetric vacuum

In this section, we analyze the existence of solutions to the equations (3.16) and (3.17), corresponding to vacua with $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry in four dimensions, and discuss their properties.

4.1 Solution to the supersymmetry condition

We first decompose the spinor representation of $SO(1,9)$ under $SO(1,3) \otimes SO(6)$ by defining the gamma-matrices:

$$\hat{\gamma}_\mu = \Gamma_\mu \otimes 1\ ,\ \ \mu = 0,\ldots,3 \tag{4.1}$$

$$\hat{\gamma}_k = \Gamma^{(4)} \otimes \Gamma_k\ ,\ \ k = 4,\ldots,9, \tag{4.2}$$

of $SO(1,3)$ and $SO(6)$, respectively. The chirality operators are defined as:

$$\Gamma^{(4)} = i\hat{\gamma}_0\hat{\gamma}_1\hat{\gamma}_2\hat{\gamma}_3 \ , \ \Gamma^{(6)} = i\hat{\gamma}_4\hat{\gamma}_5\hat{\gamma}_6\hat{\gamma}_7\hat{\gamma}_8\hat{\gamma}_9 \,, \tag{4.3}$$

and have both eigenvalues ±1. Under this decomposition, the Majorana-Weyl spinor ϵ_I, with $I = 1, 2$, of $SO(1,9)$ can be written as

$$\epsilon_I = \sum_{i=1}^{4} (\psi_{i;I} \cdot \eta_{i;I} + \psi^\star_{i;I} \cdot \eta^\star_{i;I}) \,, \tag{4.4}$$

where ψ's and η's are, respectively, Weyl spinors of $SO(1,3)$ and $SO(6)$ with positive chirality:

$$\Gamma^{(4)}\psi_{i;I} = \psi_{i;I} \ , \ \Gamma^{(6)}\eta_{i;I} = \eta_{i;I} \,, \tag{4.5}$$

while the $\psi^\star$'s and $\eta\star$'s are their complex conjugates with opposite chiralities. For a magnetic field background $\mathcal{F}$ confined in the internal T^6, the supersymmetry conditions (3.16) and (3.17) reduce to

$$\begin{aligned} (1-\Gamma)\eta &= 0 & (4.6)\\ \nabla\eta &= 0 \,, & (4.7) \end{aligned}$$

with $\eta = (\eta_{i;1}, \eta_{i;2})^T$.

Consider now the case where there are only two covariantly constant spinors of $SO(6)$, η and $\eta^\star$, conjugate to each other and with opposite chirality, which satisfy equations (4.6) and (4.7) [9]. Using the complex basis (2.10) for gamma-matrices, the condition (4.7) is then equivalent with the existence of a single holomorphic 3-form Ω and a single Kähler form J defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{i\bar{j}}\eta &= iJ_{i\bar{j}}\eta \\ \gamma_{ijk}\eta &= \Omega_{ijk}\eta^\star \,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Furthermore, the field strength $\mathcal{F}$ splits in the complex basis in purely holomorphic $\mathcal{F}_{(2,0)}$, $\mathcal{F}_{(0,2)}$ and mixed $\mathcal{F}_{(1,1)}$ parts. Using (4.8), one can then show that eq. (4.6) is equivalent to [9]:

$$\begin{aligned} (iJ+\mathcal{F})^3 &= e^{i\theta}\sqrt{|g_6+\mathcal{F}|}\frac{V_6}{\sqrt{|g_6|}} & (4.9)\\ \mathcal{F}_{(2,0)} &= 0 \,, & (4.10) \end{aligned}$$

where V_6 is the volume form of T^6 and g_6 is its metric.

Eqs. (4.9) and (4.10) impose that the magnetized $D9$ branes preserve $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry in four dimensions. In order to have more supersymmetries, extra conditions have to be imposed, related to the requirement of existence of additional covariantly constant spinors satisfying (4.6), besides the pair η and $\eta^\star$.

Eq. (4.9) can be rewritten in the form:

$$\tan\theta\,(J\wedge J\wedge\mathcal{F}-\mathcal{F}\wedge\mathcal{F}\wedge\mathcal{F})=J\wedge J\wedge J-J\wedge\mathcal{F}\wedge\mathcal{F}\,, \tag{4.11}$$

where the wedge product A^N is defined with an implicit normalization factor $1/N!$. Note that only the $(1,1)$-part of $\mathcal{F}$ appears in this formula. Formally, (4.11) can be also written as

$$\mathrm{Im}\left(\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{i}\theta}\Phi\right)=0\,, \tag{4.12}$$

with

$$\Phi=(iJ+\mathcal{F})\wedge(iJ+\mathcal{F})\wedge(iJ+\mathcal{F})\,. \tag{4.13}$$

The constant phase θ remains so far an unconstrained parameter.

4.2 θ-parameter and conserved supercharges.

Let us discuss now the set of θ-angles for which the supersymmetry preserved by the magnetized $D9$ branes is the same with the one preserved by lower dimensional branes or orientifold planes Op with $p\leq 9$. The reason is that the presence of such objects is in general necessary for tadpole cancellation [15], as we will see in the next section.

Choosing a basis on the torus T^6 where the Kähler form $J_{i\bar{j}}$ and the background field strength $\mathcal{F}$ are simultaneously diagonal $J_{i\bar{j}}=\delta_{i\bar{j}}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{i\bar{j}}=f_i\cdot\delta_{i\bar{j}}$, with $\delta\equiv\mathbf{1}_3\otimes i\sigma_2$, $J_{i\bar{j}}=J^\star_{j\bar{i}}$, $\mathcal{F}_{i\bar{j}}=\mathcal{F}^\star_{j\bar{i}}$, one can express the field strength components f_i in terms of the T-dual angles φ_i of wrapped $D6$ branes in the i-th two-torus:

$$\tan\varphi_i=f_i\,. \tag{4.14}$$

The condition (4.11) for a supersymmetric vacuum then reads:

$$\sum_i\varphi_i=\frac{3\pi}{2}-\theta\,. \tag{4.15}$$

Moreover, the supersymmetry transformation parameter preserved by the magnetized $D9$ branes has to satisfy

$$\epsilon_2=\Gamma^0\cdots\Gamma^9\rho(\mathcal{F})\epsilon_1, \tag{4.16}$$

where $\rho(\mathcal{F})$ is the spinorial representation of the action of the magnetic fluxes [16] and equals a phase, $\rho(\mathcal{F})=e^{i\sum_i\varphi_i}$.

Let us examine now the fraction of supersymmetry preserved by orientifold planes. Consider first the case of $O3$ planes [6], defined by the space of fixed points of the orientifold action, which combines the world-sheet parity with the usual parity in the six internal dimensions. The invariant supersymmetry transformation parameter under the orientifold action satisfies the equation:

$$\epsilon_2 = \Gamma^4 \cdots \Gamma^9 \epsilon_1 \,. \tag{4.17}$$

This condition, combined with the fraction (4.16) of the supersymmetry conserved by the magnetized $D9$ branes gives rise to

$$\rho(\mathcal{F})\eta_1 = -i\eta_1 \,, \tag{4.18}$$

where we used the decomposition (4.4) of the ten-dimensional spinor representation. Comparing it with (4.15), we find that the same fraction of supersymmetry can be preserved in the vacuum if the θ-angle vanishes, $\theta_{O3} = 0$.

Let us repeat now the argument for $O9$-planes. An $O9$ is the fixed plane of the world-sheet parity, and therefore the invariant supersymmetry parameter ϵ_I should satisfy

$$\epsilon_2 = \epsilon_1 \,. \tag{4.19}$$

This condition is compatible with eq. (4.16) for

$$\epsilon_1 = \rho(\mathcal{F})\Gamma^{(11)}\epsilon_1 \,. \tag{4.20}$$

Using again eq. (4.15) and choosing the chirality of the supersymmetry parameter in type IIB theory to be positive, we get from (4.20) and (4.15) the condition on the θ-angle, $\theta_{O9} = -\frac{\pi}{2}$.

A similar analysis shows that the presence of (unmagnetized) $D5$ branes or $O5$ planes is compatible with the choice for the θ-angle, $\theta_{O9} = -\frac{\pi}{2}$, while the presence of $D7$ branes and $O7$ planes is compatible with the choice of the θ-angle for $O3$ planes, $\theta_{O3} = 0$.

5 Moduli stabilization

Following our analysis of eqs. (4.10) and (4.11), we have seen that a single magnetized $D9$ brane stack preserves $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry in four dimensions for a restricted closed string moduli space. As we see below, if we introduce several magnetic fluxes in the world-volume of different $D9$ branes, it will be possible to fix completely all moduli but the dilaton.

5.1 Example: Orthogonal Torus

Before proceeding with the analysis of equations (4.9) and (4.10), we consider for illustration a simple example of a compactification on a factorized four-dimensional orthogonal torus $T^4 = (T^2)^2$. Thus, the non diagonal part of the Kähler form and complex structure τ-matrix, as well as the real part of the diagonal elements τ_{ii}, $i = 1,2$ are set equal to zero. The remaining moduli are given by the two T^2 volumes

$$J_1 = 4\pi^2 R_1 R_2 \quad , \quad J_2 = 4\pi^2 R_3 R_4 \tag{5.1}$$

and the corresponding shapes

$$\tau_{11} = i\frac{R_2}{R_1} \quad , \quad \tau_{22} = i\frac{R_4}{R_3}, \tag{5.2}$$

where R_k, $k = 1, \ldots 4$ are the four radii: $x_i = x_i + 2\pi R_{2i-1}$ and $y_i = y_i + 2\pi R_{2i}$, with $i = 1,2$. Following the Dirac quantization condition, the magnetic fields introduced in any 2-cycle of T^4 are quantized as follows:

$$H_{kl} = 2\pi\alpha' \frac{F_{kl}}{V_{kl}} = \frac{m_{kl}}{n_{kl}} \frac{\alpha'}{R_k R_l} =: p_{kl} \frac{\alpha'}{R_k R_l} \ , \quad p_{kl} \in \mathbb{Q} \,, \tag{5.3}$$

where $V_{kl} = 4\pi^2 R_k R_l$ is the area of the 2-cycle.

Consider now a $D9$ brane coupling to the magnetic field F which is switched on only in the two diagonal T^2-directions $F = (F_{x_1y_1}, F_{x_2y_2})$. This magnetized brane preserves $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry in $d = 6$ dimensions, when one of the scalars coming from the $d = 10$ vector multiplet gets zero mass [10]. The corresponding fluxes then satisfy $|H_{x_1y_1}| = |H_{x_2y_2}|$. This condition can be understood as a condition on the Kähler form:

$$\frac{p_{x_2y_2}}{J_2} = \pm \frac{p_{x_1y_1}}{J_1} \,. \tag{5.4}$$

On the other hand, if the field F is switched on in the directions $F = (F_{x_1y_2}, F_{x_2y_1})$, it preserves $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry in $d = 6$ when $|H_{x_1y_2}| = |H_{x_2y_1}|$, which can now be understood as a condition on the complex structure moduli:

$$p_{x_1y_2}\tau_{11} = \pm p_{x_2y_1}\tau_{22} \,. \tag{5.5}$$

Finally, if the $D9$ brane couples to a magnetic field $F = (F_{x_1x_2}, F_{y_1y_2})$, the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry in $d = 6$ dimensions is recovered for $|H_{x_1x_2}| = |H_{y_1y_2}|$, which can also be written as a condition on the complex structure moduli:

$$p_{x_1x_2}\tau_{11}\tau_{22} = \pm p_{y_1y_2} \,. \tag{5.6}$$

The $D9$ brane action in the background given in (5.4) reads

$$S = -\int_{\mathcal{M}_{10}} T_9 \sqrt{|g + H|} - \mu_9 \int_{\mathcal{M}_{10}} C e^H \,. \tag{5.7}$$

T_p and μ_p are the respective tension and R-R charge of a Dp brane:

$$T_p = \frac{1}{g_s} \frac{(\alpha')^{-\frac{p+1}{2}}}{(2\pi)^p} \quad ; \quad \mu_p = g_s T_p \,, \tag{5.8}$$

where $g_s =< e^\phi >$ is the string coupling, normalized so that for a $D3$ brane $g_s = 2\alpha$, with α the usual 4d gauge coupling.

After compactification to $d = 6$ dimensions on the torus T^4, the action (5.7) becomes for a supersymmetric configuration:

$$S = - \int_{\mathcal{M}_{10}} (T_9\sqrt{g_{10}} + \mu_9 C_{10}) \tag{5.9}$$

$$- \int_{\mathcal{M}_6} (T_5\sqrt{g_6}\,|m_1 m_2| + \mu_5 m_1 m_2 C_6), \tag{5.10}$$

where we denote $m_i = m_{x_i y_i}$ and $n_i = n_{x_i y_i}$. We therefore see that the magnetized $D9$ brane mimics the behavior of a $D5$ brane or a $\bar{D}5$ antibrane, depending on the sign of $m_1 m_2$ [10]. We therefore have to introduce $O5$ or $\bar{O}5$ planes in order to cancel the induced tadpole. The cases where the fluxes satisfy (5.5) or (5.6) give similar results.

Let us consider now the compactification on a six-dimensional factorized orthogonal torus $T^6 = (T^2)^3$ with moduli $J_i = 4\pi^2 R_{2i-1} R_{2i}$ and $\tau_{ii} = i\frac{R_{2i}}{R_{2i-1}}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. The $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry condition for a $D9$ brane coupled to a magnetic field $F = (F_{x_1y_1}, F_{x_2y_2}, F_{x_3y_3})$ can be deduced for example from the T-dual picture as a condition on the angles $\varphi_i = \arctan H_{x_i y_i}$:

$$|\varphi_1| + |\varphi_2| - |\varphi_3| = 0\,. \tag{5.11}$$

This relation can be written in terms of the magnetic fluxes as

$$|H_{x_1y_1}| + |H_{x_2y_2}| - |H_{x_3y_3}| = -|H_{x_1y_1} H_{x_2y_2} H_{x_3y_3}|\,, \tag{5.12}$$

when the wrapping numbers n_i are positive, corresponding to the absence of antibranes, or equivalently to angles $|\varphi_i| \in [0, \pi/2]$. By the use of the Dirac quantization (5.3), this condition can also be understood as a condition on the Kähler moduli.

In the above supersymmetric vacuum, the square root in the DBI action simplifies:

$$V_{DBI} = - \int_{\mathcal{M}_{10}} T_9\sqrt{g_4}\,(1 - |H_{x_1y_1} H_{x_2y_2}| + |H_{x_2y_2} H_{x_3y_3}| + |H_{x_1y_1} H_{x_3y_3}|)\ .$$

Thus, in this configuration, charges and tensions are induced in all three 2-cycles $[x_i, y_i]$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. However, unlike the T^4 case (5.10), negative tension is induced in the 2-cycle $[x_3, y_3]$. This is important for making possible induced 5-brane tadpole cancellation in a supersymmetric configuration involving only magnetized $D9$ branes, *i.e.* in the absence of (anti-) $D5$ branes and $O5$ planes, as it will become clear below.

5.2 Conditions for $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry

Here, we perform a general study of eqs. (4.9) and (4.10), that can be interpreted as conditions for fixing the moduli in terms of the magnetic fluxes. For that, we consider K stacks of N_a $D9$ branes, with $a = 1, \cdots, K$. Furthermore, we introduce on each stack a background magnetic field with constant field strength F^a on the corresponding world-volume and charge q_a. The magnetic fields are separately quantized, following the Dirac condition

$$q_a F^a_{kl} = 2\pi \cdot \frac{m^a_{kl}}{n^a_{kl}} \equiv 2\pi \cdot p^a_{kl} \ , \ p^a_{kl} \in \mathbb{Q} \ , a = 1, \cdots, K \,. \tag{5.13}$$

Written in the complex coordinates (2.4), the field strength decomposes in a purely holomorphic and mixed part:

$$\begin{aligned} F^a_{(2,0)} &= 2\pi (\tau - \bar{\tau})^{-1^T} \big[\tau^T p^a_{xx} \tau - \tau^T p^a_{xy} - p^a_{yx} \tau + p^a_{yy}\big] \, (\tau - \bar{\tau})^{-1} & (5.14) \\ F^a_{(1,1)} &= 2\pi (\tau - \bar{\tau})^{-1^T} \big[-\tau^T p^a_{xx} \bar{\tau} + \tau^T p^a_{xy} + p^a_{yx} \bar{\tau} - p^a_{yy}\big] (\tau - \bar{\tau})^{-1} & (5.15) \end{aligned}$$

where the matrices $(p^a_{xx})_{ij}$, $(p^a_{xy})_{ij}$ and $(p^a_{yy})_{ij}$ enter in the quantized field strength (5.13) in the directions (x^i, x^j), (x^i, y^j) and (y^i, y^j), respectively. Note that $F^a_{(2,0)}$ and $F^a_{(1,1)}$ are 3×3 matrices that correspond to the upper half of the matrix $\mathcal{F}^a$:

$$\mathcal{F}^a = -2\pi i \alpha' \begin{pmatrix} F^a_{(2,0)} & F^a_{(1,1)} \\ -F^{a\dagger}_{(1,1)} & F^{a*}_{(2,0)} \end{pmatrix} , \tag{5.16}$$

which is the modified field strength in the cohomology basis $e_{i\bar{j}}$ defined in (2.10). The supersymmetry conditions for each stack read:

$$\begin{aligned} F^a_{(2,0)} &= 0 \ , \ a = 1, \cdots, K & (5.17) \\ (iJ + \mathcal{F}^a)^3 &= e^{i\theta_a} \sqrt{|g + \mathcal{F}^a|} \ , \ a = 1, \cdots, K \,. & (5.18) \end{aligned}$$

All θ_a's have to be the same in order to preserve the same supersymmetry. We then have either $\theta_a = 0$, or $\theta_a = -\frac{\pi}{2}$ $\forall a$. Using eq. (5.14), the first condition (5.17) can be seen as a restriction on the parameters of the complex structure matrix elements τ:

$$\tau^T p^a_{xx} \tau - \tau^T p^a_{xy} - p^a_{yx} \tau + p^a_{yy} = 0 \,. \tag{5.19}$$

The second set of conditions (5.18) gives, for fixed fluxes, restrictions on the Kähler parameters. Given the parametrization of the Kähler form (2.11), these conditions read:

$$\tan\theta \, (J \wedge J \wedge \mathcal{F}^a - \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a) = J \wedge J \wedge J - J \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \,. \tag{5.20}$$

For vanishing purely holomorphic field strength imposed by (5.19), the expression for $\mathcal{F}$ reduces to the matrix

$$\mathcal{F}^a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Y^a \\ Y^{a\dagger} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \quad Y^a = \frac{1}{2}(2\pi)^2\alpha' \mathrm{Im}\tau^{-1^T} \left(p^a_{yx} - \tau^T p^a_{xx}\right) \, . \tag{5.21}$$

This splits in the real and imaginary parts:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Re}Y^a &= \frac{(2\pi)^2\alpha'}{2}\mathrm{Im}\tau^{-1^T} \left(p^a_{yx} - \mathrm{Re}\tau^T p^a_{xx}\right) \, , & (5.22) \\ \mathrm{Im}Y^a &= -\frac{(2\pi)^2\alpha'}{2} p^a_{xx} \, . & (5.23) \end{aligned}$$

Inspection of eqs. (5.19) and (5.20) shows that for each stack of magnetized $D9$ branes, we have up to three complex conditions for the moduli of the complex structure, depending on the directions in which the fluxes are switched on, whereas only one complex condition can be set on the Kähler moduli. Therefore, to fix all Kähler moduli, we must add more stacks of branes compared to the ones needed to fix the same number of complex structure moduli.

5.3 Tadpole conditions

The last information we need for a consistent setup is the number and location of lower dimensional objects, such as (anti-) D-branes or (anti-) orientifold planes, in order to cancel the tadpoles induced by the fluxes. In the case where the supersymmetry conditions (4.10) and (4.11) are satisfied, the DBI and WZ actions read:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{DBI} &= -T_9 \sum_{a=1}^{K} N_a \int_{\mathcal{M}^a_{10}} \sqrt{|g + \mathcal{F}^a|} \\ &= -T_9 \sum_{a=1}^{K} N_a \int_{\mathcal{M}_4} \sqrt{|g_4|} \int_{\mathcal{M}^a_6} \mathrm{Re}\, [e^{-i\theta_a}(iJ + \mathcal{F}^a)^3] \\ &= T_9 \sum_{a=1}^{K} N_a \int_{\mathcal{M}_4} \sqrt{|g_4|} \int_{\mathcal{M}^a_6} \Big\{ \sin\theta_a \, (J \wedge J \wedge J - J \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a) \\ &\quad + \, \cos\theta_a \, (J \wedge J \wedge \mathcal{F}^a - \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a) \Big\} & (5.24) \\ V_{WZ} &= -\mu_9 \sum_{a=1}^{K} N_a \int_{\mathcal{M}^a_{10}} C e^{\mathcal{F}^a} \\ &= -\mu_9 \sum_{a=1}^{K} N_a \int_{\mathcal{M}^a_{10}} \Big\{ C_{10} + C_8 \wedge \mathcal{F}^a & (5.25) \\ &\quad + C_6 \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a + C_4 \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \Big\} \, , \end{aligned}$$

where the integral over the manifold $\mathcal{M}_6^a$ takes into account the winding numbers n_{kl} of the different branes.

One can easily recognize in the above expressions the various tadpoles induced by the magnetic background fluxes. They correspond in the respective order to 10, 8, 6 and 4 dimensional spacetime filling tadpoles. In a consistent compactification, the introduction of Dp branes (or Op planes) with $p = 3, 5, 7, 9$ is then in general needed in order to cancel them term by term. This is however not possible in a supersymmetric configuration, because the simultaneous presence of Dp and $D(p+2)$ branes (as well as Op and $O(p+2)$ planes) would break all supersymmetries. Thus, supersymmetry can be preserved only for the special values of the angles θ_a discussed in the previous section, namely $\theta_a = 0$ and $\theta_a = -\frac{\pi}{2}$.

Indeed, when $\theta_a = -\frac{\pi}{2}$, the magnetized $D9$ branes preserve the same supersymmetry as $O9$ planes and the DBI action reads

$$V_{DBI} = -T_9 \sum_{a=1}^{K} N_a \int_{\mathcal{M}_4} \sqrt{|g_4|} \int_{\mathcal{M}_6^a} (J \wedge J \wedge J - J \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a) \tag{5.26}$$

$$V_{WZ} = -\mu_9 \sum_{a=1}^{K} N_a \int_{\mathcal{M}_{10}^a} \left\{ C_{10} + C_6 \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a) \right\}, \tag{5.27}$$

where in the last equation we assumed that the magnetized abelian generators are embedded in higher dimensional non-abelian groups and are traceless.

It is now convenient to consider a real basis ω_r of $H^2(T^6)$, with $r = 1, \cdots, h_2$, in which the quantization condition (5.13) for the magnetic fluxes reads:

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} q_a F_r^a = \frac{m_r^a}{n_r^a} = p_r^a \,. \tag{5.28}$$

We also define the quantity

$$\mathcal{K}_{rst} = \int_{T^6} \omega_r \wedge \omega_s \wedge \omega_t \tag{5.29}$$

which is a sign, following the orientation chosen in (2.1). The 9-brane R-R charge, $q_{9,R}$, coming from the first term of (5.27), reads

$$q_{9,R} = \sum_{a=1}^{K} \sum_{r,s,t} N_a \, \mathcal{K}_{rst} n_r^a n_s^a n_t^a \,, \tag{5.30}$$

while the corresponding contribution to the tension, $q_{9,NS}$, which comes from the first term of (5.26), equals:

$$q_{9,NS} = \sum_{a=1}^{K} \sum_{r,s,t} N_a \, |\mathcal{K}_{rst} n_r^a n_s^a n_t^a| \,. \tag{5.31}$$

Since we start with type I string theory with an $O9$ plane carrying 16 units of R-R charge and tension, the R-R tadpole cancellation condition implies $q_{9,R} = 16$, while supersymmetry imposes that $\mathcal{K}_{rst} n_r^a n_s^a n_t^a$ is positive:

$$q_{9,R} = 16 \quad ; \quad \mathcal{K}_{rst} n_r^a n_s^a n_t^a \geq 0 \;.\; \forall a = 1, \dots, K \,. \tag{5.32}$$

The second set of conditions comes from the induced 5-brane R-R charges and tensions, emerging from the second term of eqs. (5.27) and (5.26). For each 2-cycle $C_r^{(2)}$ of the torus T^6, they are given by $q_{5,R}^r$ and $q_{5,NS}^r$, respectively:

$$q_{5,R}^r \;=\; \sum_{a=1}^{K} \sum_{s,t} N_a \, \mathcal{K}_{rst} \, n_r^a m_s^a m_t^a =: \sum_{a=1}^{K} N_a \, q_r^a \,, \tag{5.33}$$

$$q_{5,NS}^r \;=-\; \sum_{a=1}^{K} \sum_{s,t} N_a \, |\mathcal{K}_{rst} \, n_r^a| m_s^a m_t^a \quad ; \quad \forall \, r = 1, \cdots, h_2 \,. \tag{5.34}$$

To simplify our analysis, we will restrict ourselves to the "standard" case with $\mathcal{K}_{rst} \, n_r^a \geq 0$ for any choice of 2-cycles r, s and t. This amounts to considering angles $|\varphi_i| \leq \pi/2$, or equivalently imposing the absence of anti-branes. Then, the induced tensions $q_{5,NS}^r$ and charges $q_{5,R}^r$ have opposite signs, implying that we have to add $\bar{D}5$ branes and/or $\bar{O}5$ planes in order to cancel the induced tadpoles. But then, such a configuration would break all supersymmetries. It follows that the total 5-brane tadpole contribution must vanish for any 2-cycle r:

$$q_{5,R}^r = 0 \;\;, \;\; \forall r = 1, \cdots, h_2 \,. \tag{5.35}$$

As a result, we will impose the R-R tadpole cancellation conditions (5.32) and (5.35): $q_{9,R} = 16$ and $q_{5,R}^r = 0$, together with the supersymmetry constraints (5.17) or equivalently (5.19), and

$$\mathcal{F}^a \wedge J \wedge J = \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a, \;\; a = 1, \dots, K \,, \tag{5.36}$$

or equivalently $\sum_i \varphi_i^a = 0 \pmod{2\pi}$, for any magnetized $D9$ brane stack a, in the diagonal basis of section 4.2.

Furthermore, a condition of positivity for the real part of Φ_a defined in eq. (4.13) has to be satisfied for each a, as it corresponds to the modified world-volume element of each separate brane stack:

$$\mathrm{Re}(e^{-i\theta_a} \Phi_a) > 0 \,, \quad \forall \, a = 1, \cdots, K \,, \tag{5.37}$$

with

$$\Phi_a = (iJ + \mathcal{F}^a) \wedge (iJ + \mathcal{F}^a) \wedge (iJ + \mathcal{F}^a) \,. \tag{5.38}$$

For $\theta_a = -\pi/2$, it reduces to the condition:

$$J \wedge J \wedge J - J \wedge \mathcal{F}^a \wedge \mathcal{F}^a > 0 \,, \tag{5.39}$$

which is equivalent to the positivity of the DBI lagrangian.

A similar analysis can be done for the choice of the angles $\theta_a = 0$, where the magnetized $D9$ branes preserve the same supersymmetry as $O3$ planes. This case can be obtained by T-duality from the above analysis, in a straightforward way. The role of n_r^a and m_r^a are then interchanged and the induced 5-brane R-R charge and tension is replaced by 7-brane ones.

6 Explicit example with magnetized $D9$ branes

In this section, we present an explicit example of a toroidal model, where both complex structure and Kähler class moduli are completely fixed in terms of specific choices for magnetic fluxes. Using the counting of conditions we presented in section 5.2, one has to introduce at least five brane stacks in order to fix all moduli. The model we describe below has instead nine stacks of branes with fluxes in different directions on their world-volume and $\theta^a = -\frac{\pi}{2}$. This corresponds to a type I string theory with constant internal magnetic fields on $D9$ branes.

6.1 Complex structure moduli stabilization

The choice for the fluxes in the world-volume of the different magnetized $D9$ branes is given in Table 1. Following the Dirac quantization (5.13) and the condition (5.17), the first three stacks of branes fix all complex structure moduli but τ_{12}. The diagonal elements are given by:

$$p^1_{x_1y_2}\tau_{11} = p^1_{x_2y_1}\tau_{22} \ , \ p^2_{x_1y_3}\tau_{11} = p^2_{x_3y_1}\tau_{33} \ , \ p^3_{x_1x_2}\tau_{11}\tau_{22} = -p^3_{y_1y_2} \tag{6.1}$$

These conditions on the complex structure reproduce the results described in eqs (5.5) and (5.6). They can be written as

$$\tau_{11} = i\sqrt{k_1 \cdot k_3} \ , \ \tau_{22} = i\frac{\sqrt{k_3k_1}}{k_1} \ , \ \tau_{33} = i\frac{\sqrt{k_1k_3}}{k_2}, \tag{6.2}$$

where k_i are the rational numbers

$$k_1 = \frac{p^1_{x_2y_1}}{p^1_{x_1y_2}} \ , \ k_2 = \frac{p^2_{x_3y_1}}{p^2_{x_1y_3}} \ , \ k_3 = \frac{p^3_{y_1y_2}}{p^3_{x_1x_2}}. \tag{6.3}$$

Moreover, all but τ_{12} off-diagonal elements vanish: $\tau_{ij} = 0$.

The last three stacks introduce new conditions on the complex moduli:

$$\tau_{11} = ik_5\sqrt{\frac{k_6}{k_4}} \ , \ \tau_{22} = i\sqrt{k_4 \cdot k_6} \ , \ \tau_{33} = i\frac{\sqrt{k_4k_6}}{k_6}, \tag{6.4}$$

where k_i are the ratios:

$$k_4 = \frac{p^4_{y_2y_3}}{p^4_{x_2x_3}} \ , \ k_5 = \frac{p^5_{y_1y_3}}{p^5_{x_1x_3}} \ , \ k_6 = \frac{p^6_{x_3y_2}}{p^6_{x_2y_3}} \, . \tag{6.5}$$

Stack♯	Fluxes	Fixed moduli	5 − brane localization
♯1	$(F^1_{x_1y_2}, F^1_{x_2y_1})$	$\tau_{31} = \tau_{32} = 0$ $p^1_{x_1y_2}\tau_{11} = \tau_{22}p^1_{x_2y_1}$	$[x_3, y_3]$
♯2	$(F^2_{x_1y_3}, F^2_{x_3y_1})$	$\tau_{21} = \tau_{23} = 0$ $p^2_{x_1y_3}\tau_{11} = \tau_{33}p^2_{x_3y_1}$	$[x_2, y_2]$
♯3	$(F^3_{x_1x_2}, F^3_{y_1y_2})$	$\tau_{13} = 0$ $\tau_{11}\tau_{22} = -\frac{p^3_{y_1y_2}}{p^3_{x_1x_2}}$	$[x_3, y_3]$
♯4	$(F^4_{x_2x_3}, F^4_{y_2y_3})$	$\tau_{12} = 0$	$[x_1, y_1]$
♯5	$(F^5_{x_1x_3}, F^5_{y_1y_3})$		$[x_2, y_2]$
♯6	$(F^6_{x_2y_3}, F^6_{x_3y_2})$		$[x_1, y_1]$

Table 1: Fixed complex structure moduli for each magnetized stack ♯ of $D9$ branes depending on the quantized fluxes. The last column gives the localization on the 2-cycles $C^{(2)}_r$, with $r = [x_i, y_i]$, of the induced 5-brane charges, following section 5.3.

Furthermore, they impose the vanishing of $\tau_{12} = 0$. Compatibility of the new conditions (6.4) with those of eq. (6.2) imposes that the choice of fluxes is constrained to

$$|k_4| = \left|\frac{k_3}{k_2}\right| \quad , \quad |k_5| = \left|\frac{k_1 k_3}{k_2}\right| \quad , \quad |k_6| = \left|\frac{k_2}{k_1}\right| \,. \tag{6.6}$$

6.2 Kähler class moduli stabilization

From the final form of the complex structure fixed to a diagonal purely imaginary matrix (6.2), we can write the $\mathcal{F}_{(1,1)}$ part of the field strength as the matrix (5.21) with

$$Y^a = -i\frac{(2\pi)^2\alpha'}{2}(p^a_{xx} - \tau^{-1}p^a_{yx})\,, \tag{6.7}$$

while the Kähler class is subject to the supersymmetry condition (5.36). Let us denote for definiteness the volume of the 4-cycles, corresponding to $J \wedge J$, as

$$(J \wedge J)_{i\bar{j}} = V_{i\bar{j}}\,, \tag{6.8}$$

where the indices $i, \bar{j}$ correspond to the $(1,1)$-cycle perpendicular to the given 4-cycle.

In the above notation, the fluxes introduced in the world-volume of the stacks ♯1, ♯2 and ♯6 contribute only to the real part of the complexified field strength $\mathcal{F}_{(1,1)}$. Using then the reality condition for the corresponding field strength $\mathcal{F}_{i\bar{j}} = \mathcal{F}^{\star}_{\bar{j}i}$, one finds that the supersymmetry condition (5.36) on the Kähler moduli leads to:

$$V_{1\bar{2}} - V_{2\bar{1}} = 0 \;\;,\;\; V_{1\bar{3}} - V_{3\bar{1}} = 0 \;\;,\;\; V_{2\bar{3}} - V_{3\bar{2}} = 0\,. \tag{6.9}$$

On the other hand, the magnetic fluxes on the stacks ♯3, ♯4 and ♯5 contribute only to the imaginary part of $\mathcal{F}_{(1,1)}$, and the condition (5.36) on the Kähler moduli imposes:

$$V_{1\bar{2}} + V_{2\bar{1}} = 0 \;\;,\;\; V_{1\bar{3}} + V_{3\bar{1}} = 0 \;\;,\;\; V_{2\bar{3}} + V_{3\bar{2}} = 0\,. \tag{6.10}$$

Thus, all together, the conditions (6.9) and (6.10) give:

$$V_{i\bar{j}} = 0 \;,\; \text{or equivalently } J_{i\bar{j}} = 0 \;\; \forall\, i \neq j\,. \tag{6.11}$$

It follows that only three Kähler parameters remain unfixed, corresponding to the diagonal part of the Kähler form. We must therefore introduce some new stacks of branes which add new conditions on the Kähler parameters, but preserve the values of the complex structure found previously.

One possibility is displayed in Table 2. The last three sets of fluxes

Stack♯	Fluxes	$D5$branes localization
♯7	$(F^7_{x_1y_1}, F^7_{x_2y_2}, F^7_{x_3y_3})$	$[x_1, y_1]$ $[x_2, y_2]$ $[x_3, y_3]$
♯8	$(F^8_{x_1y_1}, F^7_{x_2y_2}, F^8_{x_3y_3})$	$[x_1, y_1]$ $[x_2, y_2]$ $[x_3, y_3]$
♯9	$(F^9_{x_1y_1}, F^9_{x_2y_2}, F^9_{x_3y_3})$	$[x_1, y_1]$ $[x_2, y_2]$ $[x_3, y_3]$

Table 2: Additional stacks of magnetized $D9$ branes allowing the stabilization of the diagonal part of the Kähler form. The last column gives the localization on the 2-cycles $C^{(2)}_r$, with $r = [x_i, y_i]$, of the induced 5-brane charges, as explained in section 5.3.

introduced in the stacks ♯7, ♯8 and ♯9 give the following restrictions on the diagonal part of the Kähler form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}^7_1 & \mathcal{F}^7_2 & \mathcal{F}^7_3 \\ \mathcal{F}^8_1 & \mathcal{F}^8_2 & \mathcal{F}^8_3 \\ \mathcal{F}^9_1 & \mathcal{F}^9_2 & \mathcal{F}^9_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} J_2 J_3 \\ J_1 J_3 \\ J_1 J_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{F}^7_1 \mathcal{F}^7_2 \mathcal{F}^7_3 \\ \mathcal{F}^8_1 \mathcal{F}^8_2 \mathcal{F}^8_3 \\ \mathcal{F}^9_1 \mathcal{F}^9_2 \mathcal{F}^9_3 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{6.12}$$

Here, we denote the Kähler moduli $J_{x_iy_i} = J_i$ and the diagonal part of fluxes, which are purely real, by $\mathcal{F}^a_{x_iy_i} = \mathcal{F}^a_i$. The solution of this linear equation is constrained to positive values for the moduli J_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$, as they represent the volumes of the corresponding 2-cycles $[x_i, y_i]$.

6.3 Consistency conditions

We have seen above that the introduction of nine magnetized stacks of $D9$ branes allows us to stabilize the complex structure and Kähler class T^6-metric deformations to three factorized orthogonal tori T^2:

$$\tau_{11} = i\sqrt{k_1 \cdot k_3} \ , \ \ \tau_{22} = i\frac{\sqrt{k_3 k_1}}{k_1} \ , \ \ \tau_{33} = i\frac{\sqrt{k_1 k_3}}{k_2} , \ \ \tau_{ij} = 0 \tag{6.13}$$

This solution is acceptable only if the following three additional restrictions are fulfilled:

- In each two-torus T^2, the complex structure describes the shape of the torus,

$$\tau = \frac{R_2}{R_1} e^{i\varphi} , \tag{6.14}$$

where $R_{1,2}$ are the two radii and φ is the opening angle of the T^2 relative to the horizontal axis, with $0 < \varphi < \pi$. A purely real complex structure would correspond to the degenerate case and makes therefore no sense. From eq. (6.13), we get:

$$k_i > 0 \ , \ \ \forall i = 1, 2, 3. \tag{6.15}$$

Then, once the fluxes on the three first three stacks are chosen, the conditions (6.6) restrict the fluxes that can be switched on in the next three stacks, since $k_i,\ i = 4, 5, 6$, are determined. Moreover, a similar positivity argument based on (6.4) implies that k_i are also positive for $i = 4, 5, 6$:

$$k_i > 0 \ , \ \ \forall i = 4, 5, 6. \tag{6.16}$$

- The Kähler forms describing the volume of T^2's must be real and positive:

$$J_i = J_{x_i y_i} > 0 \ , \ \forall i = 1, 2, 3\,. \tag{6.17}$$

- The real part of the six-form $i\Phi^a$ defined in (5.38) is a volume form for every stack of branes and must therefore be positive, as displayed in eq. (5.39): $J\wedge J\wedge J - J\wedge \mathcal{F}^a\wedge \mathcal{F}^a > 0$ for all $a = 1, \ldots, 9$. Consider the example of the first stack. Here, the only non vanishing component of the expression (5.39) is written as:

$$J_{x_1y_1} J_{x_2y_2} J_{x_3y_3} + J_{x_3y_3} \mathcal{F}_{x_1y_2} \mathcal{F}_{x_2y_1} > 0\,. \tag{6.18}$$

From the restriction (6.15), we find that the product of fluxes $p_{x_1y_2}p_{x_2y_1}$ is positive. From the restriction (6.17), the Kähler forms $J_{x_iy_i}$ are also positive and the condition (6.18) is therefore trivially satisfied. This argument can be similarly applied for all the first six stacks, but the situation is different for the last three stacks of branes, where we have switched on fluxes in the three 2-cycles $[x_i, y_i],\ i = 1, 2, 3$. The condition (5.39) can now be written as:

$$1 - H_1^b H_2^b - H_1^b H_3^b - H_2^b H_3^b > 0 \ , \ \ b = 7, 8, 9\,,$$

where we defined the magnetic fields $H_i^b = \frac{\mathcal{F}^b_{x_iy_i}}{J_{x_iy_i}}$. Using the supersymmetry condition (5.36),

$$H_1^b + H_2^b + H_3^b = H_1^b H_2^b H_3^b \ \ , \ \ b = 7, 8, 9\,, \tag{6.19}$$

we get for instance (for $H_3^b \neq 0$)

$$-\frac{H_1^b + H_2^b}{H_3^b}(1 + (H_3^b)^2) > 0\ , \tag{6.20}$$

which leads to the conditions on the fluxes:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} H_1^b + H_2^b > 0 \\ H_3^b < 0 \end{array} \right. \quad \text{or} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} H_1^b + H_2^b < 0 \\ H_3^b > 0 \end{array} \right. . \tag{6.21}$$

6.4 Tadpoles

Above, we found a set of consistency conditions which restrict the allowed choice of background fluxes. They came from the geometrical character of the complex structure and Kähler class moduli, as well as from the positivity of the modified volume forms $\mathrm{Re}(i\Phi_a)$. A second set of restrictions comes from the tadpole cancellation, which we examine here.

The nine stacks of magnetized $D9$ branes induce 5-brane R-R charges q_R^r as well as NS-NS tensions in the three 2-cycles $r = [x_i, y_i]$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, given by the eqs. (5.33) and (5.34). As we argued in section 5.3, the absence of anti-branes implies that the winding numbers are positive and the total R-R 5-brane charge must vanish:

$$\mathcal{K}_{rst} n_r^a \geq 0 \qquad ; \qquad \sum_{a=1}^{9} N_a q_r^a = 0 \;\; , \;\; \forall r = [x_i, y_i] \, , \tag{6.22}$$

where

$$q_r^a = \sum_{st} \mathcal{K}_{rst} n_r^a m_s^a m_t^a = \sum_{st} \mathcal{K}_{rst} n_r^a n_s^a n_t^a p_s^a p_t^a \;\; , \;\; a = 1, \ldots, K = 9 \, . \tag{6.23}$$

Moreover, the tadpole cancellation for the 9-brane R-R charge $q_{9,R}$ of eq. (5.30) and tension leads to $q_{9,R} = 16$ and the winding number positivity condition $\mathcal{K}_{rst} n_r^a n_s^a n_t^a \geq 0$, as displayed in eq. (5.32).

Let us analyze first the contributions of the first six stacks to (6.22). Following our choice for the magnetic fluxes, the tadpoles are induced only in one of the three 2-cycles $[x_i, y_i]$, as presented in Table 1. On the other hand, the positivity conditions (6.15) and (6.16) on the first six stacks of magnetized $D9$ branes restrict the sign of the product of fluxes $p_s^b p_t^b > 0$, for $b = 1, \ldots, 6$. All charges q_r^b are therefore given by $q_r^b = \mathcal{K}_{rst} n_r^b n_s^b n_t^b p_s^b p_b^t$, and are positive, following (5.32).

The contributions of the last three stacks of branes must therefore cancel the positive charges q_r^b induced by the first six stacks. In this case, the fluxes are switched on in the three 2-cycles $[x_i, y_i]$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, and therefore tadpoles are induced in all these 2-cycles. Furthermore, the positivity condition (6.21) reduces the possible signs of the induced R-R 5-brane charges $q^b_{[x_i,y_i]}$. As the components $J_{x_i y_i}$ of the Kähler form have to be positive from the consistency requirement (6.17), a necessary condition for (6.21) to be satisfied is to use different signs for the fluxes. There are indeed three possibilities:

$$\begin{array}{l} \mathrm{sign}(p^c_{x_1 y_1}) = \mathrm{sign}(p^c_{x_2 y_2}) \neq \mathrm{sign}(p^c_{x_3 y_3}) \\ \mathrm{sign}(p^c_{x_1 y_1}) \neq \mathrm{sign}(p^c_{x_2 y_2}) = \mathrm{sign}(p^c_{x_3 y_3}) \\ \mathrm{sign}(p^c_{x_1 y_1}) = \mathrm{sign}(p^c_{x_3 y_3}) \neq \mathrm{sign}(p^c_{x_2 y_2}) \end{array} \quad ; \quad c = 7, 8, 9 \, . \tag{6.24}$$

Using (6.23) and the positivity condition (5.32), the signs of the 5-brane charges $q^c_{[x_i,y_i]}$ are given by:

$$\mathrm{sign}(q^c_{[x_i,y_i]}) = \mathrm{sign}(p^c_{x_j y_j} p^c_{x_k y_k}), \;\; i \neq j \neq k \neq i \;\; , \;\; c = 7, 8, 9 \, . \tag{6.25}$$

We therefore notice that if we switch on fluxes in all 2-cycles $[x_i, y_i]$, two of the induced charges $q^c_{[x_i,y_i]}$ contribute negatively to the tadpoles whereas only one contributes positively. On the other hand, if one of the fluxes $p^c_{x_i y_i}$ vanishes, the only tadpole contribution is precisely $q^c_{[x_i,y_i]}$, which has to be negative, because of the supersymmetry condition (5.36). Thus, in both cases, we see that the 5-brane charges induced by the last three stacks can in principe cancel the positive contribution of the first six stacks. Finally, the 9-brane charge $q_{9,R}$ (5.30) receives only positive contributions from the brane wrapping numbers n^a_r and the tadpole cancellation condition (5.32) can be easily satisfied. In Appendix A, we give an explicit numerical example where this is indeed realized.

7 Large dimensions

We have seen above that there exist configurations of magnetized $D9$ branes which lead to $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetric vacua in $d = 4$ dimensions with all moduli fixed to the geometry of three factorized orthogonal torii. The non-vanishing complex structure matrix elements correspond then to the ratio of the radii within each of the three 2-cycles, $\tau_{ii} = i\frac{R_{2i}}{R_{2i-1}}$, whereas the Kähler class moduli describe their volumes, $J_i = 4\pi^2 R_{2i-1} R_{2i}$. The latter are functions of the fluxes switched on in the last three stacks of branes. On the contrary, the values of the complex structure moduli are determined only by the fluxes introduced in the world-volume of the first six stacks. Here, we analyze the possibility of inducing a hierarchy between the string length $l_s = \sqrt{\alpha'}$ and the values of the radii [17].

To this end, let us consider the generic configuration (6.12) written in the real basis x_i, y_i, $i = 1, 2, 3$, with given fluxes $p^c_{x_i y_i}$ such that $\mathcal{F}^c_i = 4\pi^2 \alpha' p^c_{x_i y_i}$, $c = 7, 8, 9$. Moreover, we start from some given solution of the system that leads to a consistent stabilization of the Kähler moduli, of order say α'. This means that there are some positive (J_1, J_2, J_3) which solve the equations (6.12), while the induced 5-brane tadpoles in the three 2-cycles $[x_i, y_i]$:

$$\begin{pmatrix} q_{[x_1,y_1]} \\ q_{[x_2,y_2]} \\ q_{[x_3,y_3]} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} m^7_2 m^7_3 & m^8_2 m^8_3 & m^9_2 m^9_3 \\ m^7_1 m^7_3 & m^8_1 m^8_3 & m_1 m^9_3 \\ m^7_1 m^7_2 & m^8_1 m^8_2 & m^9_1 m^9_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} N_7 \\ N_8 \\ N_9 \end{pmatrix} \tag{7.1}$$

are negative, and can be cancelled by the charges induced by the first six stacks. Here, we defined $q_r \equiv \sum_{a=7}^{9} N_a q^a_r$, $m^a_i \equiv m^a_{x_i y_i}$, and we have chosen for simplicity all winding numbers equal to one, $n^a_{x_i y_i} = 1$ for $a = 7, 8, 9$, so that the flux quanta p^c_r become equal to m^c_r.

Let us now rescale the three fluxes in the direction $[x_1, y_1]$ by a factor Λ.

The conditions (6.12) on the Kähler moduli become

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Lambda\mathcal{F}_1^7 & \mathcal{F}_2^7 & \mathcal{F}_3^7 \\ \Lambda\mathcal{F}_1^8 & \mathcal{F}_2^8 & \mathcal{F}_3^8 \\ \Lambda\mathcal{F}_1^9 & \mathcal{F}_2^9 & \mathcal{F}_3^9 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} J_2^\Lambda J_3^\Lambda \\ J_1^\Lambda J_3^\Lambda \\ J_1^\Lambda J_2^\Lambda \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda\mathcal{F}_1^7\mathcal{F}_2^7\mathcal{F}_3^7 \\ \Lambda\mathcal{F}_1^8\mathcal{F}_2^8\mathcal{F}_3^8 \\ \Lambda\mathcal{F}_1^9\mathcal{F}_2^9\mathcal{F}_3^9 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{7.2}$$

which have obviously as solution the rescaled Kähler form J^Λ:

$$J^\Lambda = (\Lambda J_1, J_2, J_3) . \tag{7.3}$$

Thus, we have triggered a hierarchy between the first component J_1 of the Kähler form and α' by a factor Λ, given by the corresponding rescaling of the fluxes $m_1^c \to m_1^{c,\Lambda} = \Lambda m_1^c$ switched on in the 2-cycle $[x_1, y_1]$ of the first torus, for the three stacks of branes $c = 7, 8, 9$. In this example, the other components of the Kähler form remain at their original values, of order α'.

The rescaling of the flux quanta induces also a rescaling q_r^Λ of the 5-brane charges (7.1):

$$\begin{pmatrix} q^\Lambda_{[x_1,y_1]} \\ q^\Lambda_{[x_2,y_2]} \\ q^\Lambda_{[x_3,y_3]} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} q_{[x_1,y_1]} \\ \Lambda q_{[x_2,y_2]} \\ \Lambda q_{[x_3,y_3]} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{7.4}$$

This contribution must be cancelled by an appropriate rescaling of the fluxes introduced in the first six stacks. For simplicity, we consider the case where the ratio of the radii within each T^2 $R_{2i}/R_{2i-1} = -i\tau_{ii}$ remains of order one. The ratio of fluxes in each stack must therefore be of order unity, $k_a \sim 1$ for $a = 1, \ldots, 6$. Choosing all non-trivial winding numbers equal to one, $\mathcal{K}_{rst} n_r^a = 1$, we get that the corresponding induced 5-brane charges (6.23) are given by:

$$\sum_{a=1}^{6} \begin{pmatrix} q^{a,\Lambda}_{[x_1,y_1]} \\ q^{a,\Lambda}_{[x_2,y_2]} \\ q^{a,\Lambda}_{[x_3,y_3]} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} N_4 (m^{4,\Lambda}_{x_2x_3})^2 + N_6 (m^{6,\Lambda}_{x_2y_3})^2 \\ N_2 (m^{2,\Lambda}_{x_1y_3})^2 + N_5 (m^{5,\Lambda}_{x_1x_3})^2 \\ N_1 (m^{1,\Lambda}_{x_1y_2})^2 + N_3 (m^{3,\Lambda}_{x_1x_2})^2 \end{pmatrix} \overset{!}{=} - \begin{pmatrix} q_{[x_1,y_1]} \\ \Lambda q_{[x_2,y_2]} \\ \Lambda q_{[x_3,y_3]} \end{pmatrix} , \tag{7.5}$$

where $m_r^{a,\Lambda}$ denote the rescaled magnetic fluxes, that we determine now.

Indeed, the second part of eq. (7.5) follows from the 5-brane tadpole cancellation condition (6.22). It can be satisfied, if the fluxes of the stacks ♯1, ♯2, ♯3 and ♯5 are rescaled as:

$$\begin{aligned} m^{1,\Lambda}_{x_1y_2} &= \sqrt{\Lambda} m^1_{x_1y_2} \quad , \quad m^{2,\Lambda}_{x_1y_3} = \sqrt{\Lambda} m^2_{x_1y_3} , \\ m^{3,\Lambda}_{x_1x_2} &= \sqrt{\Lambda} m^3_{x_1x_2} \quad , \quad m^{5,\Lambda}_{x_1x_3} = \sqrt{\Lambda} m^5_{x_1x_3} , \end{aligned} \tag{7.6}$$

while keeping the corresponding ratios k_a, for $a = 1, \ldots, 6$, fixed (of order unity). Moreover, the fluxes in the stacks ♯4 and ♯6 remain unchanged. An explicit numerical example is presented in Appendix B. It follows that there is an infinite but discrete class of supersymmetric solutions, where some radii can be made arbitrarily large.

8 Stabilization of the R-R moduli

We have shown above that it is possible to fix all Kähler and complex structure moduli in a consistent toroidal compactification with magnetic fluxes, preserving $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry in four dimensions. We want now to address the question of stabilization of the R-R moduli coming from the R-R 2-form. Recall that in the type I framework we work, the only R-R potential of type IIB string theory which survives the orientifold projection is the 2-form C_2. Upon toroidal compactification from ten to four dimensions, it gives rise to $\frac{6\times 5}{2} = 15$ massless scalars c_{mn}, with $m, n = 4, \ldots, 9$. Nine of them complexify the Kähler form J, whereas the remaining six form 3 additional complex scalars.

In a general magnetic background, we have shown that the Kähler moduli get fixed. Since the new vacuum preserves $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry, the real part of the Kähler moduli formed by the corresponding nine components of the R-R 2-form should be fixed, as well. To describe the stabilization mechanism, we remind first some properties of C_2. In the low energy effective action of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$, $d = 10$ type I string theory, the field strength H_3 of the C_2 potential, $H_3 = dC_2$, gets modified by a Chern-Simons (CS) term coming from the gauge sector:

$$S_{cl} = \frac{1}{2\kappa_{10}^2} \int e^{-2\phi}(-R \star 1 + 4d\phi \wedge \star d\phi - \frac{e^{2\phi}}{2} \tilde{H}_3 \wedge \star \tilde{H}_3)\,, \qquad (8.1)$$

where $\kappa_{10}^2 = \frac{1}{4}(2\pi)^7 \alpha'^4$ and

$$\tilde{H}_3 = dC_2 - \frac{\alpha'}{4}\mathrm{Tr}(A \wedge dA - \frac{2i}{3} A \wedge A \wedge A) \qquad (8.2)$$

with A the gauge potential. Note that C_2 appears in the action (8.1) only through derivatives, as expected. In fact, upon compactification in four dimensions, all R-R scalars are associated to perturbative Peccei-Quinn symmetries.

Consider now some $U(1)$ directions with constant internal magnetic field backgrounds. The corresponding gauge potential is $A = (A_\mu, A_m)$, where A_μ is the four-dimensional field, with $\mu = 0, \ldots, 3$, and A_m describes the magnetic background potential given in section 3.1. In this case, the CS action simplifies and the interaction terms of the action (8.1) involving C_2 give rise to

$$S_{int} = \frac{1}{4g_{10}^2} \sum_a^K N_a \int_{\mathcal{M}_4} dC_2 \wedge \star(A^a \wedge F^a)\,, \qquad (8.3)$$

where $g_{10}^2 = 4\kappa_{10}^2/\alpha'$, F^a is the background field strength and N_a is the number of branes in the a-th stack. We thus obtain a kinetic mixing term between the axion fields c_{mn} and the $U(1)$ gauge bosons [10]:

$$S_{int} = \frac{1}{4g_{10}^2} \sum_a^K N_a \int_{\mathcal{M}_4} d^4x \sqrt{g_4}\, A_\mu^a \partial^\mu c_{mn}\, g_{mn,kl}\, F_{kl}^a\,, \tag{8.4}$$

where $g_{mn,kl}$ is the metric on the cohomology $H^2(T^6)$,

$$g(\alpha,\beta)_{H^2} = \int_{T^6} \alpha \wedge \star\beta\ , \quad \forall\, \alpha,\beta \in H^2(T^6)\,. \tag{8.5}$$

In the configuration presented in section 6, we introduced nine stacks of magnetized $D9$ branes, with constant field strengths on their world-volume given in Tables 1 and 2. From the kinetic mixing (8.4), it is easy to see that precisely nine combinations of the axion fields c_{mn} are absorbed by the nine magnetized $U(1)$ gauge fields and form massive gauge multiplets, together with the corresponding Kähler moduli.

In fact, in the complex basis (2.4), they are the nine R-R moduli with mixed indices $c_{i\bar{j}}$ that get absorbed into the mass of the gauge fields. More precisely, the cohomology H^2 splits into the cohomology $H^{2,0} \otimes H^{1,1} \otimes H^{0,2}$ and the metric (8.5) splits also in three terms corresponding to a metric g_1 on $H^{1,1}$ [18],

$$g_1(\alpha_1,\alpha_2) = \frac{\int_{T^6} \alpha_1 \wedge J \wedge J \int_{T^6} \alpha_2 \wedge J \wedge J}{\int_{T^6} J \wedge J \wedge J} - \int_{T^6} \alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2 \wedge J\,, \tag{8.6}$$

a metric g_2 on $H^{2,0}$ and a metric g_3 acting on their product as:

$$g_3(\alpha,\beta) = \int_{T^6} \alpha \wedge \star\beta\ , \quad \forall\, \alpha \in H^{1,1}(T^6) \text{ and } \beta \in H^{2,0}(T^6)\,. \tag{8.7}$$

Since the internal manifold has been fixed by the fluxes to be a product of three orthogonal T^2, the third part of the metric decomposition vanishes. Indeed, since the non vanishing elements of the metric are of mixed type, $g_{i\bar{j}}$, the Hodge star operation maps $(2,0)$-forms into $(1,3)$-forms. It follows that the wedge product $\alpha \wedge \star\beta$ is zero. Moreover, the vacuum configuration requires a vanishing purely holomorphic field strength $F_{2,0}^a = 0$ and, thus, the metric g_2 is irrelevant. Therefore, by the form of the mixing (8.4), only the R-R moduli that are elements of the cohomology $H^{1,1}$ are absorbed into the mass terms of the $U(1)$ gauge fields.

The purely holomorphic (and anti-holomorphic) part of the R-R 2-form can not be absorbed into the $U(1)$ mass terms. They enter however in the complex structure moduli. Indeed, the latter are parametrized by the matrix τ which has nine complex entries. Only six of them correspond to the purely (anti-) holomorphic variation of the metric $(\delta g_{\bar{i}\bar{j}})$ δg_{ij}. The remaining three complex elements correspond to the (anti-) holomorphic variation of the RR 2-form $(\delta c_{\bar{i}\bar{j}})$ δc_{ij}, which is a peculiarity of the toroidal compactification [1]. These are therefore fixed by the conditions (5.17) or equivalently (5.19). As a result, all R-R moduli are also stabilized by our choice of magnetic fluxes.

9 Generalizations and concluding remarks

In this section, we discuss the generalization of the method presented above to stabilize moduli in type I string compactifications preserving $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry in four dimensions, such as orbifolds and Calabi-Yau manifolds. An immediate problem that arises in compactifications with strict $SU(3)$ holonomy is that the only cohomology which exists is that of 3-forms $H^{3,0}$ and $H^{2,1}$, as well as the one of 2-forms $H^{1,1}$. In other words, the cohomology $H^{2,0}$ is trivial. One could then naively conclude that the condition (5.17) is trivially satisfied and, thus, the complex structure moduli cannot be fixed.

One possibility to overcome this difficulty is to combine the above mechanism with the presence of NS-NS and R-R 3-form fluxes, that fix precisely the complex structure moduli and the dilaton, but not the Kähler class. The latter can be fixed by turning on internal magnetic fields on the $D9$ branes, leading to the condition (5.18), or equivalently to (5.20). The two mechanisms are therefore complementary. Of course, in $\mathcal{N} = 1$ compactifications with holonomy different than $SU(3)$, such as $SU(2)$ times a discrete group factor, the cohomology $H^{2,0}$ is in general non-trivial and magnetic fluxes on holomorphic 2-cycles can be used to fix (at least part of) the complex structure moduli. This is for instance the case of Enrique surfaces in $\mathcal{N} = 2$ compactifications with vanishing Euler number [19].

On the other hand, below we point out that the above conclusion is naive and our method can be used to fix the complex structure, even in compactifications with $SU(3)$ holonomy and trivial $H^{2,0}$ cohomology. The reason is that despite the absence of four-dimensional zero modes for the internal components of gauge fields, that transform non-trivially under $SU(3)$ holonomy, one is still allowed to turn on (discrete) internal magnetic fields that are invariant under the holonomy group.

To illustrate this point, we consider for simplicity a $\mathcal{N} = 2$ supersymmetric example of the orbifold compactification $T^2 \times T^4/\mathbb{Z}_2$ [20]. Let us denote the complex coordinate on T^2 by z_1, and those on T^4 by z_a, with $a = 2, 3$. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$-orbifold acts on the coordinates as a parity operation on T^4:

$$\mathbb{Z}_2 : z_2 \to -z_2 \quad , \quad z_3 \to -z_3 \, . \tag{9.1}$$

The dimension of the untwisted moduli space is therefore reduced. Only five untwisted complex structure moduli remain, which are denoted, following the notation (2.4), by:

$$\tau_{11} \quad , \quad \tau_{ab} \quad ; \quad a, b = 2, 3 \, . \tag{9.2}$$

Similarly, the dimension of the untwisted Kähler class moduli is reduced to five. Moreover, the purely holomorphic 2-forms of the type $dz^1 \wedge dz^a$ are projected out by the orbifold action. The only remaining holomorphic

2-form is $dz^2 \wedge dz^3$. The massless open string spectrum on the $D9$ branes consists of a $\mathcal{N}=2$ vector multiplet of the gauge group $U(16)$ and of hypermultiplets transforming under the antisymmetric representation $\mathbf{120}+\overline{\mathbf{120}}$. The (complex) scalar components of the vector multiplets correspond to A_1^e, where A is the gauge potential and the superscript e denotes the $U(16)$ $\mathbb{Z}_2$-invariant (even) generators of the ten-dimensional $SO(32)$ gauge group. On the contrary, the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ action on the group index o of the two complex scalars A_a^o of the hypermultiplets, is odd.

For a purely holomorphic field strength to survive the orbifold projection, its components

$$F_{12} = \partial_{[1}A_{2]} \ , \ F_{13} = \partial_{[1}A_{3]} \ , \ F_{23} = \partial_{[2}A_{3]}, \tag{9.3}$$

must have an even $\mathbb{Z}_2$-parity. It follows that F_{12} and F_{13} should involve internal derivatives of the gauge potential A^o along the broken generators of the $SO(32)$, transforming as the hypermultiplets in the antisymmetric representation of $U(16)$:

$$F_{12} = \partial_{[1}A^o_{2]} \ , \ F_{13} = \partial_{[1}A^o_{3]} \, . \tag{9.4}$$

Thus, even if there is only one (2,0)-form $dz^2 \wedge dz^3$ invariant under the $\mathbb{Z}_2$-orbifold parity, all three internal components of $F_{2,0}$ survive the orbifold action. In fact, following our analysis of section 6, they are all needed in order to fix the complex structure moduli.

In conclusion, in this work we have shown that the Kähler class and complex structure moduli of type I string compactifications can be fixed by a suitable choice of internal magnetic fields, in vacua preserving $\mathcal{N}=1$ supersymmetry in four dimensions. Moreover, the moduli can be fixed at arbitrarily large values by tuning the rational quantized fluxes. In contrast to other stabilization mechanisms based on 3-form fluxes from the closed string sector, this method has an exact string description and, thus, a validity beyond the low-energy supergravity approximation. An open problem is that the dilaton remains undetermined, consistently with the perturbative nature of the mechanism. To fix the dilaton, one possibility is obviously to turn on at the same time closed string 3-form fluxes, or alternatively to use non-perturbative effects, such as multiple gaugino condensation in the unbroken gauge group sector [21].

A different direction is to study moduli stabilization in vacua with broken supersymmetry using a straightforward extension of the mechanism we described in this work. It is also interesting to apply this approach in semi-realistic string models using explicit constructions of intersecting D-brane configurations, that are related by T-duality to compactifications in the presence of internal magnetic fields.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank C. Angelantonj, R. Blumenhagen, A. Ceresole, M. Grana, M. Herbst, P. Kaste, T. Matik, K. Rulik, M. Tuckmantel and A. Uranga for useful discussions. This work was supported in part by the European Commission under the RTN contract MRTN-CT-2004-503369, and in part by the INTAS contract 03-51-6346.

A Example of consistent moduli stabilization

In this appendix, we give a numerical example of $D9$ brane magnetic flux configuration allowing for a consistent stabilization of the complex structure and Kähler class moduli of the toroidal T^6 type I string compactification. The fluxes to which the stacks $\sharp 7$ to $\sharp 9$ couple are

$$\begin{aligned}(m^7, n^7) &= \{(-2,1),(0,1),(1,1)\}\\ (m^8, n^8) &= \{(-1,1),(1,1),(-1,1)\}\\ (m^9, n^9) &= \{(0,1),(-1,1),(2,1)\}\end{aligned}$$

From equation (6.12), we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} -2 & 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} J_2 J_3 \\ J_1 J_3 \\ J_1 J_2 \end{pmatrix} = (4\pi^2\alpha')^2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{A.1}$$

Thus, our choice of fluxes fixes the Kähler moduli (J_1, J_2, J_3) to the values:

$$(J_1, J_2, J_3) = 4\pi^2\alpha' \left(2\sqrt{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \sqrt{2} \right) . \tag{A.2}$$

Moreover, if these stacks contain $N_7 = N_8 = 2$ and $N_9 = 1$ branes, the induced 5-brane tadpoles in the 2-cycles $[x_i, y_i]$ are:

$$(q_{[x_1,y_1]}, q_{[x_2,y_2]}, q_{[x_3,y_3]}) = (-4, -2, -2) . \tag{A.3}$$

Following the tadpole cancellation condition (5.35), the above R-R charges have to be cancelled by the charges induced by the first six stacks of branes. From the positivity condition (6.22) and our orientation choice (2.1), all signs $\mathcal{K}_{rst}$ (5.29) involved in the fluxes of the first six brane stacks are negative, and thus the winding numbers n_r^a, for $a = 1, \ldots, 6$, should be chosen negative, as well. Here, we consider the following choice for the corresponding fluxes:

$$\begin{aligned}
\{(m^1_{x_1y_2},n^1_{x_1y_2}),(m^1_{x_2y_1},n^1_{x_2y_1}),(m^1_{x_3y_3},n^1_{x_3y_3})\} &= \{(1,-1),(1,-1),(0,-1)\}\\
\{(m^2_{x_1y_3},n^2_{x_1y_3}),(m^2_{x_3y_1},n^2_{x_3y_1}),(m^2_{x_2y_2},n^2_{x_2y_2})\} &= \{(1,-1),(1,-1),(0,-1)\}\\
\{(m^3_{x_1x_2},n^3_{x_1x_2}),(m^3_{y_1y_2},n^3_{y_1y_2}),(m^3_{x_3y_3},n^1_{x_3y_3})\} &= \{(1,-1),(1,-1),(0,-1)\}\\
\{(m^4_{x_2x_3},n^4_{x_2x_3}),(m^4_{y_2y_3},n^4_{y_2y_3}),(m^4_{x_1y_1},n^4_{x_1y_1})\} &= \{(1,-1),(1,-1),(0,-1)\}\\
\{(m^5_{x_1x_3},n^5_{x_1x_3}),(m^5_{y_1y_3},n^5_{y_1y_3}),(m^5_{x_2y_2},n^5_{x_2y_2})\} &= \{(1,-1),(1,-1),(0,-1)\}\\
\{(m^6_{x_2y_3},n^6_{x_2y_3}),(m^6_{x_3y_2},n^6_{x_3y_2}),(m^6_{x_1y_1},n^6_{x_1y_1})\} &= \{(1,-1),(1,-1),(0,-1)\}
\end{aligned}$$

This choice satisfies the consistency conditions (6.15), (6.16) and (6.6), as all $k_a = 1$ for $a = 1, \ldots, 6$. The complex structure is then fixed to the imaginary diagonal matrix (6.2) with

$$(\tau_{11}, \tau_{22}, \tau_{33}) = i(1,1,1)\,. \tag{A.4}$$

We have therefore found a $D9$ brane magnetic background which fixes the geometry of the torus T^6 to be a product of three square torii with radii $R_{2i-1} = R_{2i}$, $i = 1,2,3$, given by (A.2). Let us now choose the number of branes in each of the first six stacks in order to cancel the charges induced by the last three stacks 7, 8 and 9. We take $N_4 = N_6 = 2$, and $N_1 = N_2 = N_3 = N_5 = 1$, so that the induced 5-brane charges (7.5) on the three 2-cycles are:

$$(q_{[x_1,y_1]}, q_{[x_2,y_2]}, q_{[x_3,y_3]}) = (4,2,2)\,, \tag{A.5}$$

which cancel exactly the charges (A.3). On the other hand, the contribution to the $D9$ brane tadpole is:

$$\sum_{a=1}^{9} N_a \sum_{rst} \mathcal{K}_{rst} n_a^r n_a^s n_a^t = 13\,, \tag{A.6}$$

implying that we have to add 3 additional non-magnetized $D9$ branes (and their images), in order to satisfy eq. (5.32).

B Moduli stabilizaton with 2 large dimensions

We want now to find an appropriate rescaling of the solution in the example shown in the previous appendix in order to induce a large volume hierarchy (compared to α'). Following the reasoning of section 7, as an illustration, we are interested in triggering two large dimensions. To do that, we rescale the component $[x_3, y_3]$ of the fluxes (A.1) by a factor $\Lambda = N^2$, for some integer N. The system of conditions on the Kähler moduli then reads:

$$\begin{pmatrix} -2 & 0 & N^2 \\ -1 & 1 & -N^2 \\ 0 & -1 & 2N^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} J_2^\Lambda J_3^\Lambda \\ J_1^\Lambda J_3^\Lambda \\ J_1^\Lambda J_2^\Lambda \end{pmatrix} = (4\pi^2\alpha')^2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ N^2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{B.1}$$

with solution:

$$J^{\Lambda} = 4\pi^2\alpha' \left(2\sqrt{2}, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}, \sqrt{2}N^2\right) . \tag{B.2}$$

The induced 5-brane charges (5.33) in the different 2-cycles are

$$\left(q_{[x_1,y_1]}, q_{[x_2,y_2]}, q_{[x_3,y_3]}\right) = \left(-4N^2, -2N^2, -2\right) , \tag{B.3}$$

for the same brane stack multiplicities we used in Appendix A.

Let us now find a flux configuration in the first six brane stacks in a way to cancel these charges, and such that the complex structure moduli τ remain at the value:

$$(\tau_{11}, \tau_{22}, \tau_{33}) = i(1,1,1) . \tag{B.4}$$

This can be achieved by choosing the ratios of fluxes equal to one, $k_a = 1$, $a = 1, \ldots, 6$. These stacks induce then six dimensional charges given by:

$$\sum_{a=1}^{6} \left(\begin{array}{c} q^a_{[x_1,y_1]} \\ q^a_{[x_2,y_2]} \\ q^a_{[x_3,y_3]} \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} 2(m^{4,\Lambda}_{x_2x_3})^2 + 2(m^{6,\Lambda}_{x_2y_3})^2 \\ (m^{2,\Lambda}_{x_1y_3})^2 + (m^{5,\Lambda}_{x_1x_3})^2 \\ (m^{1,\Lambda}_{x_1y_2})^2 + (m^{3,\Lambda}_{x_1x_2})^2 \end{array} \right) . \tag{B.5}$$

They are all positive and can cancel the tadpoles of (B.3) by choosing:

$$m^{4,\Lambda}_{x_2x_3} = m^{6,\Lambda}_{x_2y_3} = m^{5,\Lambda}_{x_1x_3} = m^{2,\Lambda}_{x_1y_3} = N . \tag{B.6}$$

With this choice of configuration, the geometry of the internal space is fixed to a product of three square torii with radii $R_{2i-1} = R_{2i}$, and

$$R_1^2 = 2\sqrt{2}\alpha' \ \ , \ \ R_3^2 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\alpha' \ \ , \ \ R_5^2 = \sqrt{2}\, N^2\, \alpha' . \tag{B.7}$$

References

[1] S. Kachru, M. B. Schulz and S. Trivedi, JHEP **0310** (2003) 007 [arXiv:hep-th/0201028];

[2] For a recent review see S. P. Trivedi, talk in stings 2004, and references therein.

[3] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. Linde and S. P. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003) 046005 [arXiv:hep-th/0301240]; S. Kachru, Tripathi and S. P. Trivedi, arXiv:hep-th/0407134.

[4] E. S. Fradkin and A. A. Tseytlin, Phys. Lett. B **163** (1985) 123; A. Abouelsaood, C. G. . Callan, C. R. Nappi and S. A. Yost, Nucl. Phys. B **280** (1987) 599; V. V. Nesterenko, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **4** (1989) 2627.

[5] C. Bachas, arXiv:hep-th/9503030.

[6] R. Blumenhagen, D. Lust and T. R. Taylor, Nucl. Phys. B **663** (2003) 319 [arXiv:hep-th/0303016]; J. F. G. Cascales and A. M. Uranga, JHEP **0305** (2003) 011 [arXiv:hep-th/0303024].

[7] G. W. Moore, arXiv:hep-th/9807087.

[8] P. Candelas and X. de la Ossa, Nucl. Phys. B **355** (1991) 455.

[9] M. Marino, R. Minasian, G. W. Moore and A. Strominger, JHEP **0001** (2000) 005 [arXiv:hep-th/9911206].

[10] C. Angelantonj, I. Antoniadis, E. Dudas and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **489** (2000) 223 [arXiv:hep-th/0007090].

[11] M. Bianchi, G. Pradisi and A. Sagnotti, Nucl. Phys. B **376** (1992) 365; C. Angelantonj, Nucl. Phys. B **566** (2000) 126 [arXiv:hep-th/9908064]; C. Angelantonj and A. Sagnotti, arXiv:hep-th/0010279; R. Blumenhagen, B. Kors and D. Lust, JHEP **0102** (2001) 030 [arXiv:hep-th/0012156].

[12] R. Blumenhagen, L. Goerlich, B. Kors and D. Lust, Fortsch. Phys. **49** (2001) 591 [arXiv:hep-th/0010198].

[13] E. Bergshoeff and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. B **490** (1997) 145 [arXiv:hep-th/9611173].

[14] E. Bergshoeff, R. Kallosh, T. Ortin and G. Papadopoulos, Nucl. Phys. B **502** (1997) 149 [arXiv:hep-th/9705040].

[15] For a review, see e.g. C. Angelantonj and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Rept. **371** (2002) 1 [Erratum-ibid. **376** (2003) 339] [arXiv:hep-th/0204089]; and references therein.

[16] M. Mihailescu, I. Y. Park and T. A. Tran, theory," Phys. Rev. D **64** (2001) 046006 [arXiv:hep-th/0011079]; E. Witten, JHEP **0204** (2002) 012 [arXiv:hep-th/0012054].

[17] I. Antoniadis, Phys. Lett. B **246** (1990) 377; I. Antoniadis, N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **436** (1998) 257 [arXiv:hep-ph/9804398].

[18] A. Strominger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55** (1985) 2547.

[19] S. Ferrara, J. A. Harvey, A. Strominger and C. Vafa, Phys. Lett. B **361** (1995) 59 [arXiv:hep-th/9505162].

[20] M. Bianchi and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. B **247** (1990) 517 and Nucl. Phys. B **361** (1991) 519; E. G. Gimon and J. Polchinski, Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996) 1667 [arXiv:hep-th/9601038].

[21] N. V. Krasnikov, Phys. Lett. B **193** (1987) 37; L. J. Dixon, SLAC-PUB-5229, *Invited talk given at 15th APS Div. of Particles and Fields General Mtg., Houston,TX, Jan 3-6, 1990.* T. R. Taylor, Phys. Lett. B **252** (1990) 59.